

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action having a mailing date of May 18, 2005. Claims 1-25 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 12, 15, 21, 22, and 24. Consequently, claims 1-25 remain pending in the present Application.

This application is under Final Rejection. Applicant has presented arguments hereinbelow that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the Amendment to clarify issues upon appeal.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 12, and 15 to recite that the at least one print spooler and the at least one relational database perform scheduling the at least one print job based on a plurality of factors including a priority of the plurality of print jobs, an availability of at least one of the plurality of printers, and at least one other factor corresponding to at least one other of the plurality of print objects. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification, page 8, line 19-page 9, line 19. Applicant has also amended claims 21, 22, and 24 to correct minor informalities. Applicant has also amended the specification to correct a minor informality.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification and to claims 21, 22, and 24 due to various informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 21, 22, and 24 to correct the informalities cited by the Examiner. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections have been addressed.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,466,935 B1 (Stuart). In addition, in response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner cited Stuart, col. 10, liens 34-40 as matching jobs with

printers. Also in response to Applicant's arguments, the Examiner noted that the limitation "automatically scheduling" print jobs was not expressly recited in the claims. With respect to claim 5, the Examiner cited col. 3, lines 34-47, 45-53, and 54-58; col. 4, lines 37-40; col. 5, lines 46-65; and col. 12, lines 21-24 of Stuart.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 1 recites a system for performing distributed printing including at least one print spooler and at least one relational database coupled with the print spooler. The relational database(s) include a plurality of tables that store a plurality of print objects. Claim 1 further recites that the at least one print spooler is configured to utilize the at least one relational database to perform scheduling print jobs based on a plurality of factors including a priority of the print job, an availability of at least one of the plurality of printers. Claim 1 further recites that the at least one other factor corresponding to at least one other of the plurality of print objects. Claims 12 and 15 recite an analogous system and method. Because of the use of the systems and method recited in claims 1, 12, and 15, system resources can be more efficiently used. Specification, page 11, lines 12-13.

Although Stuart functions for its intended purpose, Stuart fails to teach or suggest scheduling print jobs using the print spooler and the relational database based on factors including a priority of the print job, an availability of at least one of the plurality of printers and at least one other factor corresponding to at least one other print object. Stuart describes a system for controlling a manufacturing process. Stuart, Abstract, lines 1-2. In the system of Stuart, a work item having the highest priority is retrieved from the database, the work corresponding to the object performed, and the object's status updated. Stuart, Abstract and col. 4, lines 37-55. The work item could include printing, as well as other jobs. Although Stuart indicates the system is self-scheduling, this is apparently based on priorities that have already been calculated. Stuart,

col. 4, lines 37-54. These priorities which determine the scheduling are indicated to be changeable by a user. Stuart, col. 4, lines 56-63. Stuart does describe finding a print job and dispatching the job to a printer that is “ready to print.” Stuart, col. 10, lines 34-40. However, Applicant can find no indication in Stuart that the priorities, and thus the scheduling, is determined by the combination of a print spooler and the relational database based on factors including a priority of the print job, an availability of at least one of the plurality of printers and at least one other factor corresponding to at least one other print object. Instead, the scheduling in Stuart is apparently determined by the priority provided by the user, potentially in combination with printer availability. Thus, Stuart fails to teach the combination of the print spooler(s) and relational database(s) scheduling jobs based on factors including a priority of the print job, an availability of at least one of the plurality of printers and at least one other factor corresponding to at least one other print object. Consequently, Stuart fails to teach or suggest the systems and method recited in claims 1, 12, and 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 12, and 15 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-11 and 21 depend upon independent claim 1. Claims 13-14 and 22-23 depend upon claim 12. Claims 16-20 and 24-25 depend upon claim 15. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 2-11, 13-14, 16-20 and 21-25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-11, 13-14, 16-20 and 21-25 are also allowable over the cited references.

Furthermore, claim 5, 23, and 25 are separately allowable. Claims 5, 23, and 25 recite that continuous printing may be performed. Thus, printing can be achieved even though specific print servers are down. Specification, page 9, line 23-page 10, line 5. Applicant has found no mention in Stuart of performing continuous printing. The portions of Stuart cited by the

Examiner, col. 2, lines 66-67; col. 3, lines 1-2, 34-47, 45-53, and 54-58; col. 4, lines 37-40; col. 5, lines 46-65; col. 12, lines 21-24, and Fig. 2. Although these portions of Stuart describe networking of the system of Stuart and heterogeneous processing, there is no indication that continuous printing is actually performed by any portion of Stuart. Consequently, Stuart fails to teach or suggest the methods and system recited in claims 5, 23, and 25. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 23, and 25 are separately allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

July 14, 2005
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095
Janyce R. Mitchell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540